

Questions and Answers from August 30, 2012 Pre-Proposal Meeting

Q1. Should the cost proposal be submitted separately?

Yes, please provide the cost proposal in a separate envelope from the proposals.

Q2. For the Project Tasks section of the Proposal, do individual hours need to be provided for each person/classification, or can the total hours be summed for each task/subtask?

Summed hours for each task/subtask is sufficient for the general proposal (Part 3.C under Proposal Content), but details including hourly rates for each classification and detailed payment schedules are required for the Cost Proposal that is submitted separate from the general proposal.

Q3. What is the anticipated time for a funding initiative to be put before property owners or the voters?

This is generally uncertain, but C/CAG staff anticipates the initial phases will take some time to perform and the timing for both polling and putting forth an initiative is impacted by existing regular election cycles and competing funding initiatives. A driving factor in overall timing is securing sufficient funding for both C/CAG and the local jurisdictions moving into the next five-year term of the Municipal Regional Permit, which is approximately the start of calendar year 2015. C/CAG staff is looking to consultants to provide recommendations on appropriate timing.

Q4. What is the current position on this issue at the Board of Supervisors and local City/Town Councils?

C/CAG staff has presented the issue of moving forward on a countywide funding initiative at C/CAG's Stormwater and Congestion Management Technical Advisory Committees, which are typically attended by mid-level technical staff and public works/planning directors, respectively. In addition, the issue has been presented to C/CAG's Congestion Management and Environmental Quality committee, which includes some elected officials, and the C/CAG Board of Directors, which includes an elected official from all of the 21 jurisdictions. These groups have all supported moving forward with issuing the current Request for Proposals; however, C/CAG staff has not engaged individual City/Town Councils or the Board of Supervisors on this issue so cannot comment on the individual political positions of those entities. Staff anticipates C/CAG would ask individual jurisdictions to adopt resolutions of support for any proposed countywide funding initiative.

Q5. What is the status of current stormwater revenue and the relationship to jurisdictions and the flood control district?

The San Mateo County Flood Control District is different from many of the other FCDs in the Bay Area in that it only has three active flood control zones: Colma Creek, San Francisquito Creek, and San Bruno Creek. The FCD has existing assessments in place within those zones

exclusively for funding flood control activities within those areas. The FCD does, however, have a countywide zone established which provides the current mechanism for collecting the existing countywide stormwater assessment that goes directly to C/CAG for administering the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. Approximately half of the individual jurisdictions in the county have also established their own local stormwater assessments. The intent of the new countywide funding initiative would be to provide additional funds above and beyond existing sources of countywide and local revenue.

Q6. What is the San Mateo County Times level of interest/involvement in water quality issues?

C/CAG staff is generally unaware of the level of interest and involvement by the San Mateo County Times on water quality issues. There have been periodic stories published by the Times on issues relevant to implementation of the current Municipal Regional Permit requirements and a representative of the Times is on the distribution list for C/CAG's stormwater technical advisory committee agendas. C/CAG staff anticipates proactive discussions with local editorial boards in advance of proceeding with any potential funding initiative.

Q7. Have any jurisdictions implemented any funding revisions as a result of the 2008 Funding Options Report prepared for the Countywide Program by HF&H Consultants?

While C/CAG staff is aware of requests by individual jurisdictions to receive copies of the report on several occasions after the final report was initially distributed, staff is not aware of any specific instances of jurisdictions implementing measures described in the report.

The report can be found here:

<http://www.flowstobay.org/documents/municipalities/Program%20Funding/SMCWPPP%20final%20report%2010June08.pdf>

Q8. What is C/CAG or the Countywide Program's current level of public outreach?

The primary focus of the Countywide Program's Public Information/Participation program has been meeting outreach requirements in the Municipal Regional Permit. There has been a focused effort to direct the public to the recently updated website (www.flowstobay.org), with a significant increase in annual visitors over the years. There have been bus ads recently (no billboards), typical press releases, and local outreach efforts, but the primary focus has been on the mandated compliance actions in the Municipal Regional Permit (school age outreach, hosting citizen involvement and community outreach events, etc.). C/CAG staff is interested in alternative approaches to public outreach and education as part of this effort that may be more cost effective than the traditional approach of educational mailers to impacted parcels, such as community engagement campaigns that target interested/supportive groups or members of the community to help carry the message of the need for increased funding.

Q9. Will C/CAG “cherry-pick” consultants from different teams of proposers, or only select entire teams?

Although this issue has not been discussed internally at C/CAG, staff anticipates simply making recommendations based on review of proposals and would not selectively choose consultants from multiple proposal teams.

Q10. Does C/CAG have an estimated budget for the various tasks/phases in the RFP?

No, C/CAG staff has been making very general budget estimates based on what is known about the cost for the recent Contra Costa Clean Water Program’s stormwater funding initiative and scaling on a population/parcel basis to conditions in San Mateo County, but has not established budgets for the different phases of work. In addition, staff is hoping consultant teams may be able to come up with cost-effective approaches to the various steps on the process, such as a community engagement campaign vs. educational mailers to reduce printing and postage costs.

Q11. Is C/CAG expecting costs for printing and postage to be include in consultant proposals?

C/CAG staff is not expecting those costs to be part of a consultant’s proposed compensation package, however, if anticipated costs for the necessary mailings are known, it would be helpful for budgeting purposes to know what consultants think they will be and can be included in proposals as informational items.

Q12. Is the anticipated funding from a countywide initiative expected to be 100% return to source?

C/CAG staff is open to considering all options for how funding initiatives could be structured, but is assuming a countywide assessment would be put on the tax rolls through the County Flood Control District, a portion would be taken off the top to cover Countywide Program costs, and the remainder distributed back to the jurisdictions in proportion to the population/parcels within the individual jurisdictions. As such, with the exception of the portion going to fund Countywide Program activities, the rest of the funding would be return to source.